



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*Am*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,136	03/19/2001	Edward M. Willhide	013495/0015 (B69913)	7589

136 7590 06/15/2005

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC  
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W.  
SUITE 600  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/812,136

Applicant(s)

WILLHIDE ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,9,12-14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,9,12-14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to the Amendment and Remarks filed on 3/22/2005. Claims 2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 15 are canceled. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12-14 and 16-20 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claims section, claim 16, page 4, line 19, "...one or more of **the** group..." should be changed to "...one or more of **a** group..." since "the" lacks antecedent basis of the claim. For examination purpose, Examiner assumes the limitation as "a group of".

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 1 recites the limitation "**the** status of the enterprise" in claims section, page 2, line 12, word 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 13, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith (hereafter Smith), U.S. Pat. No.6,901,430.

As to claim 1, Smith discloses a system for monitoring and managing an enterprise network (ordering network), the system comprising:

a plurality of management systems (330, 338, 334, 336 fig.3) that provide management data for the enterprise network, each management producing management data concerning monitored operating events (providing ordering and tracking information to consumer's information, see abstract, fig.3, col.7 line 28 to col.8 line 42).

a management interface system [ 322 fig.3] receiving management data from one or more management systems (330, 338, 334, 336 fig.3) that provide the management data for the network (providing available products matching customer's specification, see col.8 lines 24-62).

a portal system (portal 318 fig.3) coupled to the management interface system, the portal system receiving the management data from the one or more management systems and presenting the management data in a predetermined format (see col.8 line 43 to col.9 line 53).

a client view system (enabling consumer 312 fig.3 to view images or pages) coupled to the portal system (portal 318 fig.3), the client view system receiving format data and management data and generating client view data for displaying the status of the enterprise network on a real time basis (providing products information including status history of orders from consumers to servers, see col.9 lines 11-53 and col.31 lines 20-49 and col.12 line 56 to col.13 line 27); and

a workflow system (622 fig.7B) coupled to the portal system, the workflow system receiving the management data from the one more management systems and providing one or more workflows response to the management data, the work flows providing corrective measures that correct monitored operating events (identifying and confirming orders by consumers, see fig.7B, col.12 line 16 to col.13 line 35).

As to claim 4, Smith discloses a channel format system coupled to the portal system, the channel format system receiving channel format data (providing real time configuration data and pricing) and using the channel format data to interface with one of the management systems (see col.7 lines 8-63).

As to claim 5, Smith discloses wherein each of the plurality of management system has a log-in procedure, the system further comprising a user login system (344 fig.3) (using account identifiers, passwords of users to authorize users) coupled to the portal system, the user login system receiving user identification input data (user data) and generating management system login data for access to each of plurality of management system (providing authentication services according to users' name/password to access to the ordering system, see fig.3, col.9 lines 65).

As to claim 9, Smith discloses an element information system coupled to the portal system, the element information system receiving network element data from one or more network elements (312 fig.3) and providing the network element data (client data requests for order information) to the portal system (see fig.3, col.9 line 11 to col.10 line 48).

As to claim 13, Smith discloses a client layer that provides visual representation data for a component (see col.9 lines 11-53 and col.31 lines 20-49 and col.12 line 56 to col.13 line 27) ).

As to claim 14, Smith discloses a method for monitoring and managing an enterprise network made up of a plurality of management systems (330, 338, 334, 336 fig.3) that provide management data for the enterprise network, each management producing management data concerning monitored operating events (providing ordering and

Art Unit: 2151

tracking information to consumer's information, see abstract, fig.3, col.7 line 28 to col.8 line 42), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving management data from one or more management systems (330, 338, 334, 336 fig.3) and presenting the management data in a predetermined format (providing available products matching customer's specification, see col.8 lines 24-62).

receiving management data in a predetermined format a client view for displaying the status of the enterprise network on a real time basis (providing products information including status history of orders from consumers to servers in real time, see col.9 lines 11-53 and col.31 lines 20-49 and col.12 line 56 to col.13 line 27); and

providing one or more workflows (work flow 622 fig.7B) response to the management data, the work flows providing corrective measures that correct monitored operating events (identifying and confirming orders by consumers, see fig.7B, col.12 line 16 to col.13 line 35).

As to claim 17, Smith discloses a method for generating a user request comprising: selecting one or more application data fields of a first application and creating a workflow process map (configuring a process to accommodate orders from customers, see fig.35, col.30 lines 29-65) and assembling the data fields (status orders in fig.35) and the process map into a process and storing the process (see col.31 line 20 to col.32 line 23).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 6, 7, 12 and 16, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Pulliam et al. (hereafter Pulliam), U.S. pat. No.6,609,108.

As to claim 6, Smith's teachings still applied as in item 6 above. Smith does not specifically disclose a workflow edit system. However, Pulliam in the same network consumer environment discloses a workflow edit system (dealer 1160 fig.16) for receiving workflow from an operator [initiating an order change from a customer, see fig.16, col.19 lines 7-65]. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pulliam's workflow edit system into



the computer system of Smith to control users' orders because it would have enabled users to customize to individual ones of the customer-specific variants and to provide a proper status history of orders to multiple users in the Web-based environments (see col.20 lines 1-52).

As to claim 7, Smith's teachings still applied as in item 6 above. Smith does not specifically disclose a workflow execution system. However, Pulliam in the same network consumer environment discloses a workflow execution system (644 fig.16) for execute predefined workflows (orders) (placing orders to the system, see fig.16, col.19 lines 7-65). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pulliam's workflow execution system into the computer system of Smith to control users' orders because it would have enabled users to customize to individual ones of the customer-specific variants and to provide a proper status history of orders to multiple users in the Web-based environments (see col.20 lines 1-52).

As to claim 12, Smith's teachings still applied as in item 6 above. Smith does not specifically disclose a web server- layer that generates \*.HTML data for a component and performs translation of data for the component. However, Pulliam in the same network consumer environment discloses a web server- layer that generates \*.HTML data for a component and performs translation of data for the component (using browser software applications to create documents and sending information to the

servers, see fig.3, col.7 line 46 to col.8 line 59). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Pulliam's teachings into the computer system of Smith to control users' orders because it would have enabled users to customize general purpose web pages and allowed users to download/access web pages stored on servers connected to the Internet (see col.7 lines 46-64).

As to claim 16, Smith's teachings still applied as in item 6 above. Smith does not specifically disclose preventing the operation of one or more of the group including a TOP call command, a hard-coded URL, a hard-coded frame reference, or rule-based text manipulation of proxied data sources. However, Pulliam in the same network consumer environment discloses preventing the operation of one or more of the group including a TOP call command, a hard-coded URL, a hard-coded frame reference, or rule-based text manipulation of proxied data sources (returning only orders matching customer's input requests including URL image orders, see fig.8, col.14 line 1 to col.15 line 20). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Pulliam's teachings into the computer system of Smith to control users' orders because it would have enabled users to customize to individual ones of the customer-specific variants and to provide a proper status history of orders to multiple users in the Web-based environments.

As to claim 18, Smith does not specifically disclose selecting one or more workflow application data fields for a second workflow application, modifying the workflow process map to include the second workflow application data fields, assembling the first workflow application data fields; the second workflow application data fields, and the workflow process map into the workflow process and storing the workflow process a workflow system. However, Pulliam in the same network consumer environment discloses selecting one or more workflow application data fields (orders from the customers with various configuration parameters) for a second workflow application, modifying (initiate a change) the workflow process map to include the second workflow application data fields (see fig.24), assembling the first workflow application data fields; the second workflow application data fields, and the workflow process map into the workflow process and storing the workflow process a workflow system (processing and controlling consumer orders with various configuration parameters, see fig.24, col.22 line 28 to col.23 line 60). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pulliam's teachings into the computer system of Smith to control users' orders because it would have enabled users to customize to individual ones with various configuration parameters and to provide a proper status history of orders to multiple users in the Web-based environments.

As to claim 19, Smith does not specifically disclose performing a workflow process test to determine whether the workflow generates acceptable results and storing the workflow process if the workflow generates acceptable results. However, Pulliam in the

same network consumer environment discloses performing a workflow process test to determine whether the workflow generates acceptable results and storing the workflow process if the workflow generates acceptable results (using a tag attribute to indicate the approval, see fig.28) (processing and controlling consumer orders with various configuration parameters and sending a result of orders, see fig.28, col.22 line 28 to col.23 line 60 and col.26 lines 16-60). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pulliam's teachings into the computer system of Smith to control users' orders because it would have enabled users to customize to individual ones with various configuration parameters and to allow the workflow manager to response properly to customers' requests in the Web-based environments.

As to claim 20, Smith does not specifically disclose associating one or more flags with the workflow process; and presenting a user with a user-selectable control to allow the user to execute the workflow when the one or more flags are activated. However, Pulliam in the same network consumer environment discloses associating one or more flags with the workflow process; and presenting a user with a user-selectable control to allow the user to execute the workflow when the one or more flags are activated (using a tag attribute to indicate the approval, see fig.28) (processing and controlling consumer orders with various configuration parameters and sending a result of orders, see fig.28, col.22 line 28 to col.23 line 60 and col.26 lines 16-60). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to implement

Pulliam's teachings into the computer system of Smith to control users' orders because it would have enabled users to customize to individual ones with various configuration parameters and to allow the workflow manager to response properly to customers' requests in the Web-based environments.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12-14 and 16-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

\*Applicant asserts that the cited reference does not disclose a plurality of management systems that provide management data for the enterprise network, each management producing management data concerning monitored operating events and a client view system coupled to the portal system, the client view system receiving format data and management data and generating client view data for displaying the status of the enterprise network on a real time basis as newly amended.

*Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner respectfully points out the new reference (Smith) discloses monitoring and managing an enterprise network (ordering online network) comprises a plurality of management systems (330, 338, 334, 336 fig.3) that provide management data for the enterprise network, each management producing management data concerning monitored operating events (providing ordering and tracking information to consumer's information, see abstract, fig.3, col.7 line 28 to col.8 line 42) and a client view system (enabling consumer 312 fig.3 to view images or pages)*

*coupled to the portal system (portal 318 fig.3), the client view system receiving format data and management data and generating client view data for displaying the status of the enterprise network on a real time basis (providing products information including status history of orders from consumers to servers, see col.9 lines 11-53 and col.31 lines 20-49 and col.12 line 56 to col.13 line 27) as rejected above. This is equivalent to what is claimed. Therefore, the rejection of the claims is respectfully maintained.*

### **Conclusion**

10. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12-14 and 16-20 are rejected.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Khanh Dinh  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2151  
6/12/2005